

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-9 and 11-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11-22 are pending. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims under examination is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Chris Kelly and Examiner Son Huynh for granting Applicants' representative the courtesies of an Examiner Interview on August 9, 2006. During the Examiner Interview, Applicants' representative discussed the differences between Applicants' invention and the references relied upon by the Examiner. Applicants' representative also discussed various proposals for clarifying the claims in view of these differences as set forth below in further detail.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,706 to McNeill *et al.* ("McNeill"). Applicants traverse this rejection because McNeill does not disclose all the features of the claimed invention as set forth in Applicants' response dated December 14, 2005.

Nonetheless, solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this matter, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the differences between the claimed invention and the references relied upon by the Examiner. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to clarify, among other things, that "***at least the first broadcast network is a broadcast network other than an Internet network.***" McNeill does not disclose at least this aspect of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, McNeill does not anticipate claim 1 and this rejection must be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that "***the set of application components [includes] an executable computer code component and a data component.***" McNeill does not disclose at least this aspect of the claimed invention. For at least this additional reason, McNeill does not anticipate claim 1 and this rejection must be withdrawn.

Claim 9 includes clarifications similar to those made to claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, McNeill does not anticipate claim 9 and the rejection must likewise be withdrawn. Claims 2-8, and 11-22 depend from and add features to one of claims 1 and 9. For at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 and 9, McNeill does not anticipate these defendant claims and the rejections must likewise be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,107 to Travaille *et al.* ("Travaille") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,471 to Agrapharam *et al.* ("Agrapharam") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,199 to McKeown *et al.* ("McKeown"). Applicants traverse this rejection because the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention as set forth in Applicants' response dated December 14, 2005.

Nonetheless, solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this matter, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the differences between the claimed invention and the references relied upon by the Examiner. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to clarify, among other things, that "***at least the first broadcast network is a broadcast network other than an Internet network.***" Travaille, Agrapharam, or McKeown, either alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest at least this aspect of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claim 9 includes clarifications similar to those made to claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, the references relied upon by the

Examiner do not teach or suggest claim 9 and the rejection must likewise be withdrawn. Claims 2-8, and 11-22 depend from and add features to one of claims 1 and 9. For at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 and 9, the references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the defendant claims and the rejections must likewise be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: September 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Rick A. Toering
Registration No. 43,195

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct Dial: 703-770-7620
Fax: 703-770-7901